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Ana Donnelly
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BMC Medical Education

Dear Dr Donnelly,

MEED-D-18-00835R1- Evaluation of the undergraduate Family Medicine clinical appointment of Faculty of Medicine, University of Kelaniya: Quantitative and qualitative feedback

Thank you for your mail regarding your views on our manuscript and reviewer’s comments on requirements for minor review.

We appreciate the efforts of the reviewers in giving us constructive comments and have addressed the comments below.

We believe the revisions have helped improve the quality of the manuscript and thank you for the opportunity to submit a revised version.

Best Regards
Reviewer 2:

Required no further changes

Review by Reviewer 3:

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

No - there are minor issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with sufficient technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

No - there are minor issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Probably - with minor revisions

REQUESTED REVISIONS - My concern is about the methodology adopted. The quantitative and qualitative responses are from two different groups. It would have been better to let the entire class fill the questionnaire and then a select group (based on appropriate sampling method) to complete the qualitative form. I am not sure though, if these changes can be made at this stage.

Thank you for your comment. We agree that the methodology you suggest would have been a more robust way to conduct the comparison. While it is not possible to change the methodology we have now acknowledged this as a limitation. Please see Limitations, page 16, line 325 to 330.

GENERAL COMMENTS: Authors have addressed a very important area of program evaluation, which is missing in many educational programs. such evaluations will help to improve the quality of teaching-learning, as well as maintain standards.
Since I have not seen the previous MSS, I am not able to make a comparison but looks like that considerable effort has gone in to make the revisions.

Thank you for your comments.

I suggest a table to include the emerging themes and supporting comments to make it better understandable.

In reporting the results of this particular study many of the comments form an integral part of the text. We believe that putting the narratives separately in a box may disturb the flow and detract from the context and hope you agree.

Similarly for the Likert scale responses, it may be better to club all agrees and disagrees into one and make only 3 columns viz. Agree, Neutral, Disagree. Making finer distinctions like SA versus A doesn't add to value.”

Yes, we agree with your view and have made the suggested changes to the table. We also removed the decimal places as it was felt they didn’t add anything meaningful to the values.